## GOP.gov

## HOUSE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE

J.C. WATTS, JR. CHAIRMAN 4<sup>th</sup> District, Oklahoma Reforming Washington Securing America's Future



## -Update-

[Note: Complete descriptions of the following amendments were not available in time for the *Floor Prep* printed earlier today.]

The Unanimous Consent Agreement (UC) of June 20 allows for 10 minutes of debate on the following amendments:

**Ms. Kaptur** has an amendment in order that requires the VA to submit to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, by March 30, 2000, a report on the activities of VA Mental Illness Research Education and Clinical Centers (MIRECCs) for the previous year. The report will include the amount allocated to MIRECCs, the number centers operated, and a description of the research activities carried out by those centers. During hearings held before the VA-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee the VA did not offer a full and complete report on the activities of MIRECCs. The amendment is intended to allow Congress the opportunity to ensure that the MIRECCs are assisting veterans. **Staff Contact: Sean Murphy**, **x5-4146** 

**Mr. Pascrell** has an amendment in order that designates \$100,000 in VA funds for outreach programs to veterans. The funds will be used to educate veterans about the broad range of entitlements and services available from the VA. In order to avoid being subject to a point of order the amendment reduces the VA Departmental Administration General Operating Expenses by \$100,000 and subsequently increases the same account by \$100,000. **Contact:** x5-5751

Mr. Saxton has an amendment in order that increases funding for the National Estuary Program (NEP) by \$33.9 million for FY 2001 (for FY 2000 the NEP was appropriated \$18 million and this year \$16.1 million is provided). The NEP is a unique program that brings together a broad coalition of governmental and non-governmental groups to craft comprehensive conservation and management plans (CCMPs) for threatened and impaired estuaries. The amendment funds planning and implementing CCMPs. On May 8, 2000 the House passed legislation authorizing \$50 million for FY 2001 for the NEP program. *Staff Contact: Charlotte Skidmore*, *x5-4765* 

Messers. Roemer, Ganske, Duncan, LoBiondo, Luther, Kind, Camp and Ramstad, and Ms. Woolsey, Rivers and Roukema have an amendment in order that deletes the \$2.1 billion from the NASA human space flight account. The amendment will used those funds to provide the NSF with an additional: (1) \$405 million for research and related activities, (2) \$62 million for major research equipment, (3) \$34.7 million for education and human resources, and (4) \$5.9 million for salaries and expenses. The amendment also provides NASA's Space, Aeronautics and Technology account with: (1)



\$290 million for the Space Launch initiative, (2) \$20 million for the Living With a Star initiative, (3) \$6 million for the small aircraft transportation system, and (4) \$49 million for aviation system capacity. Lastly, the amendment reserves \$942 million for debt reduction. *Staff Contact: Pete Spiro (Roemer) x5-3915* 

The UC allows for 20 minutes of debate on the following amendment:

**Mr. Edwards** has an amendment made in order that (1) increases funding for the VA Health Administration by \$500 million, (2) adds \$35 million to the VA Medical and Prosthetic Research account, and (3) specifies that any reduction in the tax on estates enacted in 2000 and beginning before 2003 not apply to a taxable estate in excess of \$20 million. *Staff Contact: Tim Bromelkamp*, *x5-6015* 

The UC allows for 30 minutes of debate on the following amendments:

**Mr. Obey** has an amendment in order, likely to be offered by Mr. Holt, that fully funds the president's request of \$4.57 billion for the National Science Foundation by adding \$508 million to the bill. (There is no offset so it is subject to point of order.) *Staff Contact: Michael Stephens*, *x5-3481* 

Messers. Collins and Linder have an amendment in order that prohibits any funds from being used to designate new Clean Air Act ozone nonattainment areas, prior to June 15, 2001 in order to allow the Supreme Court to render is decision on new federal air quality standards prior to new designations. On May 14, 1999 the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit Court ruled that the EPA usurped Congress' legislative authority in promulgating strict new standards on air quality. The Supreme Court will hear the EPA's appeal this fall. *Staff Contact: Matt Ramsey (Collins)*, x5-5901, Ryan Van Meter (Linder), x5-4272

**Mr. Boyd** has an amendment in order that increases the FEMA Disaster Relief account by \$2.6 billion. Currently, the account contains \$300 million, which is \$2.6 billion less than the Administration requested and \$2.4 billion less than was appropriated last year. The \$2.9 billion request from the administration is the five year average of the cost of disasters in the United States. The \$300 million in the account was designated as emergency spending and the \$2.6 billion would be designated as emergency spending as well.

Messers. Olver and Inslee have an amendment in order that clarifies that the Kyoto proviso currently in the bill does not affect activities authorized by existing U.S. law. This supplemental language does not modify the fundamental Kyoto bill language, which remains identical to the language included in law in FY 1999 and FY 2000. Neither the current proviso nor its predecessors restrict activities otherwise authorized in law; only new, currently unauthorized regulatory activities are affected if the authority to undertake those activities flows exclusively from ratification of the Kyoto Protocol by the Senate. This amendment is offered to overcome the report language included by the Appropriations Committee on June 12, 2000 that attempts to define in a different manner than in previous years activities that are or are not authorized by existing laws including the Clean Air Act (H. Rept. 106-674 p.51 and 52). Adoption of this amendment is intended to reestablish that the definitions of the reach of the underlying Kyoto provision should remain as originally described in the conference report adopted by the House in 1998 (H. Rept. 105-769, p 273 and 274), and should not be based on a report issued by the Committee without the opportunity for approval or amendment by the entire Congress. *Staff Contact: Suzanne Dumont, x5-5335* 

Eric Hultman: Managing Editor

Brendan Shields: Senior Legislative Analyst

Courtney Haller, Jennifer Lord

& Greg Mesack: Legislative Analysts

